

CITY OF MUSKEGON
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES

July 15, 2004

P. Sartorius called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m., and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: T. Harryman, B. Mazade, P. Sartorius, T. Johnson, B. Smith, T. Michalski, L. Spataro

MEMBERS ABSENT: S. Warmington, excused; J. Aslakson, excused.

STAFF PRESENT: B. Lazor, H. Griffith

OTHERS PRESENT: D. Glomb, 692 W. Hackley; C. Sanford, 1159 Kampenga; D. Bialik, 2330 Vincent; L. Meiers, 1646 Ritter; P. Meyer, 2391 Barclay; S. Norman, 312 Cross; B. Joy-Holmes, 473 Mulder; C. Shepherd, 408 Monroe; B. Frazier, Fleis & VandenBrink; J. Williams, 1482 Morgan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 10, 2004 was made by T. Johnson, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B. Mazade arrived at 4:07 p.m.

Hearing; Case 2004-26: Request to rezone the properties located at 692 W. Hackley Ave and 706 W. Hackley Ave. from R-1, Single Family Residential to either B-2, Convenience and Comparison Business or B-4, General Business, by Doug Glomb. B. Lazor presented the staff report. The subject properties are located on Hackley Ave between Beidler St and Business – 31. Currently there are two residential homes on the properties. The property is located directly east of the Crown and Bridge Laboratory (dentist). To the South are residential uses and a muffler shop. Residential uses are on all other sides. The proposed use of this property is for a new Chalet House of Flowers. They are currently located in the city at 2100 Henry Street. The owners are looking to expand the business. The requirements for frontage and size are the same for B-2 as well as for B-4 zoning Districts. The minimum lot size is 10,980 square feet with 100 feet of frontage. 706 Hackley has 12,920-sq. ft. and 692 Hackley has 6,460-sq. ft. Together they total to just under 20,000-sq. ft., which is more than adequate for these zoning districts. Staff has offered up two zoning districts for discussion because of the nature of the area. The street is busy, being a direct entrance from Business – 31. There are other B-4 Zoning classifications in the near vicinity (the closest one is across Hackley). The commission members were provided with the preambles for both zoning districts. The B-4 district does allow the

same uses as in a B-2 district. A big difference between the B-2 and the B-4 classification is that the B-4 allows some automotive services as principal uses. The B-4 district allows more intense uses than the B-2 district. The Future Land-Use Map shows the subject property as R1 and RT residential. The map also shows across Seaway and to the south of the property as commercial. The map shows what is currently residential is slated for the future as residential. The subject property is located in Sub-Area 6: Barclay Street Sub-Area: a) It is the goal of the Master Plan to retain the mixed-use character of Sub-Area 6 and to demonstrate how varying land uses may co-exist, as well as compliment each other. b) The area lying between Henry Street and Seaway Drive is slowly becoming a solid core area of commercial development. While some residential and industrial uses do exist, it is anticipated they will ultimately be replaced by commercial facilities. c) Sub-Area issue: There is a lack of buffering between commercial and residential development. d) Sub-Area issue: Due to its location, the City may experience a demand for the expansion of commercial development between Henry Street and Seaway Drive. This would necessitate the removal of homes (located in the area between Hackley and Young Streets). The City has invested considerable funds in this area for purposes of maintaining its residential character. e) Master Plan Recommendation: Implement, through zoning, controls to ensure adequate buffers between commercial and residential development. f) Master Plan Recommendation: Complete the full commercial development of that area lying between Henry Street, Laketon Avenue, Seaway Drive, and Sherman Boulevard. Staff has received the following public comments: 1) Mr. Derouin of 696 Hancock left a phone message saying: As far as he is concerned go ahead and do it. 2) Betty Sifuentes of 2231 Poliski called in on 7/9 to say she has lived here all her life and is concerned about the junk and noise. She does not want to have to move. She does not want more noise. She says her sister lives next door and does not want it either. C. Jude of 2229 Poliski called and is okay with a flower shop going in there, but opposes more noise. The future land use map shows these properties as residential, however the Master plan calls for the development of this area as commercial. Either of these Zoning classifications would work for the proposed business. The area already has B-4 in the vicinity. Staff is comfortable with either zoning classification although the B-2 would be of a lower intensity and may serve to buffer the residential units behind the property from traffic and higher intensity uses. While the proposed zoning does not agree with Future Land Use Map, this proposed zoning may be a positive for the area

B. Smith arrived at 4:09 p.m.

L. Spataro stated that it is good to see local businesses expanding. He asked the applicant if they had looked at other properties that have the correct zoning already. D. Glomb stated that they liked the location. L. Spataro asked if the homes would be moved or demolished. D. Glomb stated that they wouldn't be able to be moved due to the age of the homes. They will both be demolished and they will build a 2500 sq. ft. building on the site. L. Spataro asked about sheltering the business from the neighboring residential properties. D. Glomb stated that they would work with the Planning Commission and do whatever is needed.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by L. Spataro, supported by T. Harryman and unanimously approved.

T. Johnson stated that this would be a good transitional area. It is hard to imagine new housing going there. He would be okay with a B-2 zoning district recommendation, but felt that B-4

would be too intense for the area. T. Harryman agreed. T. Johnson asked if there were any limitations to building size in the B-2 zoning district. B. Lazor stated that under a B-1 zoning district, there are limitations, but not under a B-2. L. Spataro stated that he has some concerns with this, but felt if it were rezoned there should be appropriate screening to the residential neighborhood. He could support a B-2 zoning. T. Johnson suggested having the site plan go before the Planning Commission due to the fact the commission members had some concerns with screening. L. Spataro stated that he would agree, but since the Planning Department is low on staff, he would be willing to allow the administration to view it because the applicant and staff has heard the concerns of the Planning Commission. B. Mazade agreed. He felt that screening is critical and that staff could review the site plan. T. Michalski felt that staff could approve the site plan.

A motion that the request to rezone properties at 692 and 706 W. Hackley, from R-1, Single Family Residential to B-2, Convenience and Comparison Business should be recommended for approval to the City Commission pursuant to the City of Muskegon Zoning Ordinance, and the determination of compliance with the intent of the City Master Land Use Plan and zoning district intent, was made by B. Mazade, supported by T. Johnson and unanimously approved.

Hearing; Case 2004-27: Request for a Special Use Permit for a church at 2330 Barclay Street (Former Moose Lodge), by Chris Sanford. B. Lazor presented the staff report. The subject property is located on Barclay approximately mid-block between Sherman and Hackley. The property is 272,931.8-sq. ft. in size and contains the former Moose Lodge. The building on the property is 14,360-sq. ft. in size. The property is zoned R-1, Single Family Residential which permits church facilities as special uses. The property is surrounded with residential zoning. R-1 to the East and West. There is a PUD overlay for the Wildwood Creek housing development to the south. The property to the north is zoned RM-1, Low density Multiple-family Residential. The property is the former Moose Lodge. This is a private club and was also rented out as a banquet facility. The applicant has submitted a description of the proposed activities that would occur at the church. These include: Fellowship dinners, outdoor cookouts for the community, after school tutoring and mentoring program for school aged children, vacation bible school, and various Christian Fellowship activities. All of these proposed activities fit in with the activities of a church. The applicant has indicated that there will not be any alcohol sold or served on the premises even though the current owners did this activity. Staff did not feel that the applicant needed to submit a full site plan because the site and building are existing. The applicant states that changes will be merely cosmetic. The applicant will need to work with the Inspections department to bring the property up to any necessary code. Since the building is already in place reviewed the site as it sits. Staff has the following comments: a) If a dumpster is to be used for the use, it will need to be screened or located out of the public view. b) Some parts of the parking lot are in mild disrepair. Staff would suggest that the applicants fix the cracks and remove vegetation from the cracks to make the lot safer. Staff would also recommend that the applicant restripe the lot as the paint has faded and is hard to see where the parking spaces are. c) No information on signage is give, the applicant will need to meet the ordinance signage requirements for the R-1, Single family zoning district. d) The zoning ordinance requires that Religious institutions have One (1) parking space for each (6) seats or twelve feet of pews in the main unit of worship. The applicant states that the main unit of worship will not seat more than 200 people so there is a requirement of 33 parking spaces. From the applicants description the property contains 191 parking spaces, so this is more than

adequate for the use. e) A concern of staff is the amount of traffic that this use will generate. Staff has received a letter stating that the traffic is already too much for the area. Being a church, the traffic generation problems should be only for a short period of time. Barclay is considered a Collector Street. These streets carry traffic from minor streets to arterial streets. Staff has received the following public comments: 1) Steve Warmington left a message on 7/8/04 saying that he is opposed to the Moose Lodge as a church. He wants to keep it on the tax rolls. 2) A letter was received from John MacDonald of 2297 Barclay St., who was in opposition of the request. A copy of the letter was provided to the commission members. 3) Frank Sohasky of 2281 Barclay called on 7/9 to voice his objection to the permit. He said that he does not like the idea of the property being taken off of the tax rolls. He is concerned about outdoor activities, noise, and traffic. He is concerned that if it becomes a church, it should stay a church and not be developed as residential further down the road. 4) Lorraine Kinnucan of 2418 Valleywood Ct. was concerned with the noise activity in the summer. She also didn't want to see this property taken off the tax roll. Staff recommends approval of the request with the conditions.

L. Spataro asked if there would be any long term developments for the site. C. Sanford stated that it would depend on the growth of the church. A parsonage may be developed on the site. Any expansions would be based on the growth of the ministry. They may have a need to expand in about 5 years. B. Smith asked how close the applicant was to closing on the property. C. Sanford stated that they are still working on it. T. Harryman asked if this was an existing congregation and if so, where they currently hold their services. C. Sanford stated that it is an existing congregation and they are currently holding their services at Edgewood Elementary in Muskegon Heights. D. Bialik asked if the building would need to be brought up to code if the request is approved. He also asked what the times and what kind of activities would be on the site. B. Lazor stated that any problems with the building would need to be fixed. C. Sanford explained the types of activities that would probably be going on. They currently have services on Wednesday evenings and on Sundays for a couple of hours each day. He doesn't feel that traffic would be an issue. The building would be air conditioned so the windows wouldn't be open in the summer time. The building is an eyesore right now and their desire is to make it something a community would feel is presentable. L. Meiers, who spoke on behalf of her father who resides at 1060 Wildwood, stated that she would be very disappointed if the Moose Lodge were to become a church. They would prefer to see it as more residential homes. P. Meyer stated that if the property were to become tax exempt, this would take away from everyone. He doesn't feel this is in the best interest of the area. He also felt that the traffic would be a problem.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by T. Harryman, supported by B. Smith and unanimously approved.

B. Mazade stated that the zoning allows a church as a special use in the residential area. He doesn't think this is the highest and best use due to the location and size. P. Sartorius added that whether the property is on the tax roll or not, doesn't apply to any of the standards that they are to use for approval. He read the standards off. L. Spataro stated that about a year ago, they had heard a request about a commercial banquet service, which wanted to locate on the property. There didn't seem to be a big concern about the traffic at that time. He doesn't feel this would be a negative. He is concerned about the size of the property. There are limited areas, such as

this, that could be developed into residential homes. He added that if the property were to be developed into homes, this would create more traffic. He is inclined to support the request. T. Harryman asked if the Moose Lodge was a permitted use under the zoning ordinance. P. Sartorius stated that it was a nonconforming use. L. Spataro added that the property had been rezoned to single family when the Moose Lodge had quit operations. It had been zoned RM-1. B. Mazade had suggested having the SUP for a portion of the property. T. Johnson stated that it would be hard to determine where it should be since they don't know how the building is positioned on the property exactly, but it could be done. The commission members discussed where the building was located on the property. L. Spataro stated that if the SUP were granted, the church would be okay for this location. It would generate less income, but he wasn't sure that would make a difference. The church would be a good use there. If the SUP isn't granted, they may have precluded any possible use for the building, which would create a hardship on the owner and could create more blight. He felt this would be a less intense use than had been previously proposed for the site. B. Mazade stated that he didn't have a problem with a church being located on the site. P. Sartorius stated that he did feel that part of the property could be developed. B. Mazade suggested placing reasonable conditions on it.

A motion that the special use permit for a church at 2330 Barclay by C. Sanford be approved, based on compliance with the City's Master Land Use Plan and conditions set forth in the City of Muskegon Zoning Ordinance based on the following conditions: 1) If a dumpster is to be located on the site, it will be either located out of public view or screened with a minimum 4-foot screen fence. 2) Signage details will be provided to staff and will need to meet the zoning ordinance requirements. 3) The applicant will need to work with the inspections department to meet all codes for the building. 4) Contingent upon the purchase of the property by the church, was made by B. Smith, supported by L. Spataro and approved with T. Michalski voting nay.

Hearing; Case 2004-28: Staff initiated request to amend Section 401 of Article IV (R-1, Single Family Residential); Section 601 of Article VI (RT, Two Family Residential); Section 701 of Article VII (RM-1, Low Density Multiple-Family Residential); Section 801 of Article VIII (RM-2, Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential); Section 901 of Article IX (RM-3, High Density Multiple-Family Residential) to amend the Special Land Use language in regards to permit uses serving and selling alcohol. B. Lazor presented the staff report. The Planning Commission has asked staff to come up with language to possibly allow the sale of alcohol under special use permit in the residential zone. Staff has consulted with the City Attorney about the language and that is provided below. Since the language is the same in all residential districts except the MHP, Mobile Home Park district, staff feels to be consistent the language if approved should be applied to all residential districts except the MHP district. The proposed language was provided to the commission members. The City Attorney had looked over the proposed language.

L. Spataro stated that he felt this is good. He suggested some time restraints for renewal of the Special Use Permits that this would be effective in. He had suggested every 3 years. P. Sartorius felt this should be a condition on a case by case basis. T. Johnson stated that this should be approved by the LCC. He has a problem with the idea as a whole. He felt that they were taking 1 situation and changing it for all the zoning areas proposed. He felt that this could cause a real problem. T. Harryman stated that he understands the concerns. He looks at trying to keep the small stores in the neighborhood. He would like to keep this at the Planning

Commission level. T. Johnson explained the reason behind the current zoning language. L. Spataro understood the need for a legacy store in residential zoning districts. He also added that there aren't that many left in the City. S. Norman stated that he lives near 407 Marquette. He has seen how the times have changed and this neighborhood is good and stable. The previous owner promised that there would be no alcohol or lotto sales. He described the area surround this store. He would be opposed to changing the language to allow for the sale of alcohol. P. Sartorius explained that this isn't just for the 1 property, it would be allowed in all the residential zones. C. Shepherd stated that she understood the dilemma the commission members are in. She also understands why this came up. She didn't feel this needed to be discussed and doesn't feel this should be changed. She is opposed to changing the language. B. Joy-Holmes stated that she also didn't want to see alcohol sales in the Jackson Hill neighborhood. P. Sartorius stated that if the zoning language were to change, the owner of 407 Marquette would need to apply for a Special Use Permit and there would be a public hearing to address any concerns that the neighbors may have regarding the sale at that location. L. Spataro explained how the zoning language change had come about. He explained the difference between rezoning a property or having the sale of alcohol as a SUP in a residential zoning district. Should a property be rezoned for business, then they would be allowed to sell alcohol. If the zoning language for a residential zoning district is changed to include alcohol sales under a SUP, then they would need to go before the PC and it would need to be approved. At that time, the public may comment, conditions can be placed on the SUP (hours of operation were an example given), and if the conditions of the SUP are violated, it may be revoked. S. Norman felt that the neighborhood should have say in any time limits that are placed on it.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by L. Spataro, supported by T. Harryman and unanimously approved.

T. Johnson stated his concerns and asked if this were to pass, what would happen with 407 Marquette at the City Commission level for the rezoning request. L. Spataro explained that the rezoning request was put on hold pending his request. He felt that this was a better compromise. T. Harryman stated that he would prefer the language change over the rezoning of a property to allow for it. T. Michalski stated that the PC could revoke a SUP. He felt that if they limit the hours of operation, then they should be consistent with the time no matter which neighborhood it is in. This will help strengthen a neighborhood. B. Mazade stated that based on the previous meeting minutes and discussions, this would be a good compromise. The commission members discussed changes to the language and they are as follows:

New Language

Deletions are ~~crossed-out~~ and additions are in **bold**.

6. Previously existing or established commercial uses not already converted to a residential use may be authorized under Special Use Permit for the following [amended 12/99]:
 - a. Retail and/or service establishments meeting the intent of the neighborhood Limited Business Zone (B-1) dealing directly with consumers including:
 - 1) Any generally recognized retail business which supplies new commodities on the premises for persons residing in adjacent residential

areas such as: groceries, meats, dairy products, baked goods or other foods, drugs, dry goods, and notions or hardware.

- 2) Any personal service establishment which performs services on the premises for persons residing in adjacent residential areas, such as: shoe repair, drop-off dry cleaning shops, tailor shops, beauty parlors, barber shops, dressmaker, tailor, pharmacist, or an establishment doing radio, television, or home appliance repair, and similar establishments that require a retail character no more objectionable than the aforementioned, subject to the provision that no more than five (5) persons shall be employed at any time in the sale, repair, or other processing of goods.
 - 3) Professional offices of doctors, lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, osteopaths, architects, engineers, accountants, and similar or allied professions.
 - 4) Restaurants, or other places serving food, except drive-in or drive-through restaurants.
- b. Prohibited uses: Activities specifically prohibited include repair or service of motor vehicles and other large equipment; ~~uses serving or selling alcohol~~, manufacturing processes which would normally require industrial zoning; any activity which may become a nuisance due to noise, unsightliness or odor; and any activity which may adversely affect surrounding property.
- c. Conditions:
- 1) Outdoor storage is prohibited.
 - 2) The area devoted to approved uses shall not exceed 2,500 square feet.
 - 3) All goods produced on the premises shall be sold at retail on the premises where produced.
 - 4) All business, servicing, or processing shall be conducted within a completely enclosed building, or in an area specifically approved by the Planning Commission.
 - 5) Parking shall be accommodated on site or with limited street parking.
 - 6) Hours of operation ~~may~~ **shall** be limited by the Planning Commission **in the SUP.**
 - 7) Signs must comply with those set forth for the residential zoning district.
 - 8) **The Planning Commission may allow a use to serve or sell alcohol, however the Commission may limit the type of license applied for or obtained for the sale of alcohol (SDD or to an SDM, with or without**

~~dancing~~), hours of operation, and any other restrictions intended to stabilize, protect, and encourage the residential character of the area. The use must gain approval from the Michigan Liquor Control Commission before alcohol can be served or sold.

A motion that the amendments to Section 401 of Article IV (R-1, Single Family Residential); Section 601 of Article VI (RT, Two Family Residential); Section 701 of Article VII (RM-1, Low Density Multiple-Family Residential); Section 801 of Article VIII (RM-2, Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential); Section 901 of Article IX (RM-3, High Density Multiple-Family Residential) of the Zoning Ordinance be recommended to the City Commission for approval, was made by L. Spataro, supported by T. Johnson and approved with B. Smith voting nay.

NEW BUSINESS

Case 2004-29: Request for site plan review for a new multiple-family housing development at 860 Marquette avenue, by James Williams. B. Lazor presented the staff report. The subject property is located east of Getty on Marquette Avenue. The property is approximately 1.96 acres. It is located next to the City owned property that was recently rezoned to R-1, Single Family Residential. The applicant is proposing 22 single and two story duplex apartment units, which are both one and two story. The units will have a one stall garage built into the front. There are proposed to be two entrances off of Marquette. Staff has reviewed the Site plan and has the following comments: a) The vicinity map needs to show the correct location of the project. b) There are 44 parking spaces available with one in front of the garage and on inside. This meets ordinance requirements. The applicant will need to dimension the area involved in the parking to show that it meets the minimum 8'X18' requirement. c) Is the road going through going to be an actual private street or just a driveway? This will need to be indicated. The minimum width for two traffic is 22'. This needs to be dimensioned on the plan. d) The lights are labeled as 18' tall with 100% cutoff, which meets ordinance requirements. e) The buildings will need to meet the residential design criteria as stated in the zoning ordinance (i.e. size, design, compatibility... etc.) Staff is very concerned that the building at the rear of the property is one building unit, even though there are offsets in the design. These may need to be broken up in order to gain access behind the structures. Setbacks are determined from the dripline of the building to the property line, is this the case? f) The plan shows that there is 30% greenspace. The ordinance requires that there be 15% dedicated common openspace. g) There is a proposed 6' tall wood fence. Details need to be provided about this fence. It may not be this tall in front of the front building line of the property. h) The typical dimension of each type of building needs to be shown. Elevations should be shown to the Planning Commission. i) How are pedestrians getting through the site? Will there be walking paths or sidewalks? j) There is a dumpster with a 6' fence. This fence needs to be an obscuring type and also needs to screen the front of the dumpster. k) The landscaping plan shows that there are 22 canopy trees and 6 understory trees. There are 9 trees around the detention basin that aren't labeled. Staff is assuming these are understory. No bushes are shown on the plan. These will need to be added to meet ordinance requirements. There are many trees on site that currently exists. Some are shown to be saved. Protective measures need to be installed around the trees to prevent damage from construction equipment. There are several trees that may not have to be removed if they are protected. Staff suggests that all trees not directly affected by construction need to be saved.

l) No signage information is provided. If any new signs are proposed, they should be included on the plan and will need to meet ordinance requirements of the residential districts. m) The Department of Public works has reviewed the site plan (Comments received on 7/6) and has accepted the plan with the following comments – “Project location map as shown is inaccurate.” n) The fire Department has reviewed the site plan (comments received on 7/5) and has denied the plan. Fire has the following comments. 1) Access around structures. See international Fire Code SEC 503.1.1. 2) Fire Flow – water supply information needed. 3) Hydrants - amount needed shall comply with IFC appendix C. 4) Fire Suppression may be required. This project shall meet standards for NFPA 1141 Planned Unit Development. o) Staff provided the commission members with comments from the Engineering Department. Staff recommends approval of the request with condition.

B. Lazor showed how which building could be eliminated on the site plan for fire access and suggested that the other buildings could be brought in a little more. B. Frazier stated that the road would be a private road. There would be water and sewer public easements. The private road would also be used as a walk path.

B. Smith left at 6:06 p.m.

L. Spataro stated that he was fine with everything, but there needs to be sidewalks. J. Williams stated that he would put the sidewalks in, but didn't feel they were necessary since this was going to be a private area. B. Mazade had some concerns regarding the detention basin being located in the front of the complex. He didn't feel that it should be so close to the street and suggested it be placed elsewhere if it is needed. He also asked if there was sanitary sewer for building 9 as it wasn't shown on the plan. B. Frazier stated that each of the buildings has their own sewer line and they would be sure that it is shown on the next site plan. B. Mazade had some concerns regarding the number of mature trees that were proposed to be removed. J. Williams stated that the site plan is showing more trees than what is there. He stated that there are only about 12 trees on the site. B. Mazade stated that they should preserve as many trees as possible. T. Michalski stated that he wasn't sure if sidewalks would be needed on both sides of the private street. L. Spataro showed where the sidewalks could go on the plan and connect to the City sidewalk.

A motion that the proposed site plan for a new multiple family housing development at 860 Marquette be, approved based on the following conditions: 1) A revised site plan will be submitted for staff approval (possible Planning Commission Review if needed changes are significant). The revised site plan will contain: a) A vicinity map showing the actual location of the project. b) Dimensions of parking, drives, and buildings. A note will need to be added indicating that the parking and drives will be paved. c) 15% dedicated common open space. d) Details for fencing surrounding property. e) The Dumpster screenings shall be detailed. f) Landscaping shall meet ordinance requirements including type, size and number of plants. Clear vision at the intersections of the new access ways will need to be maintained. g) Signage, if needed, will need to be shown on the plan and will need to meet the residential signage requirements. h) Access around structures. See international Fire Code SEC 503.1.1. i) Fire Flow – water supply information needed. j) Hydrants - amount needed shall comply with IFC appendix C. k) Fire Suppression may be required. This project shall meet standards for NFPA 1141 Planned Unit Development. 2) All other conditions placed upon the development by other

city department will need to be met including all codes including, but not limited to, building codes. 3) Move the detention basin. 4) Eliminate building #5. 5) Work with staff to retain as many mature trees as possible. 6) Show utility connection lines for each unit. 7) Be sure there is fire access where building #5 was located. 8) Add 4-ft. sidewalks and connect them to the City sidewalk, was made by L. Spataro, supported by B. Mazade and unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Hearing; Case 2004-25: Staff initiated request vacate Broadmoor St. between Albert Ave and Wesley Avenue. Staff has withdrawn the case.

OTHER

Harbour Towne Sidewalks – B. Mazade gave an update regarding the Harbour Towne Sidewalks. He stated that they are waiting for the Condo Association to respond.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

hmg